2016 Greater Cleveland Quality of Life Study
Public Safety and Policing Module Results
January 16, 2016

The Public Safety Module, which is part of the 2016 Greater Cleveland Quality of Life Study, assessed respondents' views on a wide variety of issues concerning public safety and policing. The survey was conducted in two parts. The first round of data collection occurred between October 7-19, during which time the CRI surveyed 470 residents of Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina, Summit, and Portage Counties using online panel data with quotas in place for gender and age. Although the first survey reflected the social and demographic make-up of the seven-county area, an additional round of data collection occurred between November 10 and December 3 to oversample African American and Latino respondents. The final sample size was 562.

The survey asked respondents about the extent to which the following issues are major problems, minor problems, or not a problem at all:
  • Neighborhood problems, such as crime, vandalism, trash, and drugs/alcohol
  • Tension between different groups (e.g., different races, ages, religions, and sexual orientations)

It also asked respondents to rate the following aspects of their neighborhood:
  • Safety of public schools
  • Ability of police to protect people
  • Level of professionalism neighborhood police department displays

The third part of the public safety module asked respondents to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:
  • I trust that the police in my neighborhood will protect me when I need them to.
  • The police in my neighborhood are effective in controlling crime in my neighborhood.
  • I feel safe in my neighborhood during the day.
  • I feel safe in my neighborhood at night.
  • The police in my neighborhood have too much power.
  • The police in my neighborhood act differently toward different groups of people.
  • The police officers in my neighborhood treat all people with respect.

The fourth part of the module asked respondents to indicate (a) whether they sought help from the police; and (b) whether police approached or stopped them. Then respondents were asked to rate how they were treated on a scale ranging from "very poorly" to "very well."

The fifth and final part of the module asked respondents about how the news media portrays police officers; whether they think that the shootings of unarmed African American men were isolated incidents; and whether they believe that the tensions between whites and African Americans will eventually be worked out.

In what follows, we include cross-tabulations for the entire sample's responses to each of these questions. For some items, we also analyze how attitudes about these issues and problems differ by age, education, income, gender (male vs. female), race (white vs. non-white), political ideology (conservatives vs. moderates and liberals vs. moderates), partisanship (Republicans vs. Independents and Democrats vs. Independents), and whether respondents live in Cleveland proper (see Appendix A). To do so, we use ordered logistic regressions and logistic regressions. Because logistic regressions are non-linear, we also utilize predicted probabilities to interpret the relative influence of each variable. All data are weighted to reflect general population parameters for the seven-county region in Northeast Ohio. Noteworthy findings are highlighted in yellow. The word "significant" is used to denote findings that are statistically significant.

The 2016 Greater Cleveland Quality of Life Study: Public Safety Module

Q30 "Now we're going to ask you some questions about your opinions of the safety of your community. Here is a list of things that are sometimes mentioned as neighborhood problems. Please indicate whether each item is not a problem, a minor problem, or a major problem in your neighborhood: (1) amount of crime; (2) amount of vandalism (e.g., graffiti, broken windows); (3) amount of trash; and (4) amount of alcohol and drugs."

```
Amount of Crime

  Prob: Crime |      Freq.      Percent        Cum.
--------------+----------------------------------
   No Problem |   134.00823       23.84        23.84
Minor Problem |  254.517698       45.29        69.13
Major Problem |  173.474072       30.87       100.00
--------------+----------------------------------
        Total |        562      100.00
```

INTERPRETATION: Most respondents report that each of these issues is a minor problem. For Vandalism and Trash, "no problem" was also a common response. The cross-tabulations are below. However, these cross-tabulations obscure differences in attitudes by one's level of education, income, rate, and neighborhood. Our regression model (see **Model 1** in Appendix B) shows that people who re less educated and people who earned less money were significantly *more likely* to report that crime in their neighborhood is a problem. In addition, non-whites were *more likely* to report crime is a problem. Finally, people who live in Cleveland proper were about 192% *more likely* to report that the amount of crime in their neighborhood is a problem. There were no significant differences with respect to age, gender, ideology, or partisanship.

```
Amount of Vandalism

        Prob: |
    Vandalism |      Freq.      Percent        Cum.
--------------+----------------------------------
   No Problem |  222.837098       39.65        39.65
Minor Problem |  242.313957       43.12        82.77
Major Problem |  96.8489455       17.23       100.00
--------------+----------------------------------
        Total |        562      100.00
```

INTERPRETATION: We also estimated a regression model to predict the likelihood of reporting that vandalism was a major problem in one's neighborhood (see **Model 2** in Appendix B). We find that people who are less educated, non-whites, Republicans, and people who live in Cleveland proper were significantly *more likely* to report that it is a problem. Residents of Cleveland were 82% *more likely* to report that vandalism is a problem in their neighborhood. People of color were also *more likely* to report that vandalism is a problem. There were no significant differences with respect to age, income, gender, or political ideology.

```
Amount of Trash

   Prob: Trash |      Freq.     Percent       Cum.
---------------+----------------------------------
   No Problem |   209.91393      37.35       37.35
Minor Problem | 266.980372      47.51       84.86
Major Problem | 85.1056983      15.14      100.00
---------------+----------------------------------
        Total |        562     100.00
```

> INTERPRETATION: Pluralities of Northeast Ohioans cite the amount of trash in their neighborhoods as a "minor problem."

> Our regression model shows that there are significant differences in attitudes by age, income, race, and location (see **Model 3** in Appendix B). Older people, wealthier people, and whites were more likely to report that trash is a problem. In addition, people who live in Cleveland proper were about 139% *more likely* to report that trash is a problem in their community. There were no significant differences with respect to education, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

```
Amount of Drugs and Alcohol

  Prob: |
Alcohol/Drugs |      Freq.     Percent       Cum.
---------------+----------------------------------
   No Problem | 124.702756      22.19       22.19
Minor Problem | 251.729087      44.79       66.98
Major Problem | 185.568157      33.02      100.00
---------------+----------------------------------
        Total |        562     100.00
```

> INTERPRETATION: There is much more consensus among our respondents that alcohol and drugs are major problems in Northeast Ohio. Our regression model predicting the likelihood of reporting drugs and alcohol in one's neighborhood as major problems shows that people who are less educated, and people who live in Cleveland proper, are *more likely* to report that drugs and alcohol are major problems (see **Model 4** in Appendix B). People who are less educated were *more likely* to report that alcohol and drugs are major problems, and people who live in Cleveland proper were about 58% *more likely* to report that alcohol and drugs are major problems. There were no significant differences with respect to age, income, gender, race, political ideology, or partisanship.

Q31 "Here is another list of things that are sometimes mentioned as neighborhood problems. Please indicate whether each item is not a problem, a minor problem, or a major problem in your neighborhood: (1) Amount of tension between races; (2) Amount of tension between old and young; (3) Amount of tension between religious groups; and (4) Amount of tension between groups of different sexual orientation?: [Response categories: no problem, minor problem, major problem]

```
Amount of tension between races

Prob: Tension |
   btwn races |      Freq.     Percent       Cum.
---------------+----------------------------------
   No Problem | 296.617984      52.78       52.78
Minor Problem | 168.822698      30.04       82.82
Major Problem | 96.5593179      17.18      100.00
---------------+----------------------------------
        Total |        562     100.00
```

INTERPRETATION: The cross-tabulations show that most people believe that tensions between different groups in Northeast Ohio are not major problems.

However, regression models (see **Model 5** in Appendix B) shows that younger people were *more likely* to report that tension between races is a problem. Compared to Independents, Republicans were *less likely* to report that racial tensions are a problem. Finally, people who live in Cleveland proper were about 88% *more likely* to believe that tension between races is a problem. There were no significant differences with respect to education, income, gender, or political ideology.

We did not estimate additional regression models to parse out differences in attitudes with respect to tensions between old and young, between different religious groups, and people of different sexual orientations. The cross-tabulations are below.

Amount of tension between old and young

```
Prob: Tension |
        btwn |
   old/young |       Freq.      Percent        Cum.
--------------+----------------------------------
  No Problem | 359.148871        63.91        63.91
Minor Problem |  162.69818        28.95        92.86
Major Problem | 40.1529493         7.14       100.00
--------------+----------------------------------
       Total |        562       100.00
```


Amount of tension between religious groups

```
Prob: Tension |
        btwn |
    religious |
       groups |       Freq.      Percent        Cum.
--------------+----------------------------------
  No Problem | 413.639394        73.60        73.60
Minor Problem | 112.099869        19.95        93.55
Major Problem | 36.2607371         6.45       100.00
--------------+----------------------------------
       Total |        562       100.00
```


Amount of tension between groups of different sexual orientation

```
Prob: Tension |
btwn groups - |
       sexual |
  orientation |       Freq.      Percent        Cum.
--------------+----------------------------------
  No Problem |368.3904503        65.55        65.55
Minor Problem |142.6495253        25.38        90.93
Major Problem | 50.9600244         9.07       100.00
--------------+----------------------------------
       Total |        562       100.00
```

Q32 "Overall, how would you rate the... (1) Safety of public schools in your neighborhood; (2) Ability of police to protect people in your neighborhood; (3) Level of professionalism your neighborhood police department displays?" [Response categories: very poor, somewhat poor, somewhat good, very good]

(1) Safety of public schools in your neighborhood

```
Rate: Safety |
      public |
     schools |       Freq.      Percent         Cum.
-------------+-----------------------------------------
   Very poor | 25.1611379         4.48         4.48
Somewhat poor |  79.924991        14.22        18.70
Somewhat good | 244.868782        43.57        62.27
   Very good | 212.045089        37.73       100.00
-------------+-----------------------------------------
       Total |        562       100.00
```

Interpretation: The data indicate that most respondents (about 81%) feel that the safety of their public schools was either somewhat good or very good, and about 19% of respondents feel that the safety of their public schools is somewhat poor or very poor.

A somewhat different picture emerges when we examine how attitudes vary by age, income, gender, race, ideology, partisanship, and neighborhood (see **Model 6** in Appendix B). The regression models show that older, wealthier, white males were *more likely* to rate the safety of their neighborhood schools as good, while people who live in Cleveland proper were *less likely* to rate the safety of their neighborhood schools as good. There were no significant differences with respect to education, political ideology, or partisanship.

(2) Ability of police to protect people in your neighborhood?

```
Rate: Police |
         for |
  protection |       Freq.      Percent         Cum.
-------------+-----------------------------------------
   Very poor | 23.9009723         4.25         4.25
Somewhat poor | 72.6425155        12.93        17.18
Somewhat good | 247.690019        44.07        61.25
   Very good |217.7664927        38.75       100.00
-------------+-----------------------------------------
       Total |        562       100.00
```

Interpretation: Most respondents (about 83%) feel that the ability of police to protect their neighborhood is either somewhat good or very good, compared to about 17% of respondents who feel it is somewhat poor or very poor.

When we examine how attitudes vary among respondents, we find that people who are older, wealthier, and white are *more likely* to believe that the police will protect them, as are people who live in suburban neighborhoods (see **Model 7** in Appendix B). People who live in Cleveland proper were *less likely* to rate the ability of the police to protect people in their neighborhood as good. In addition, whites were about 61% *more likely* to believe that their police department can protect people in their neighborhood. There were no significant differences with respect to education, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

(3) Level of professionalism your neighborhood police department displays?

```
 Rate: Police |
professionali |
          sm |      Freq.      Percent        Cum.
--------------+----------------------------------
   Very poor | 22.0511752        3.92        3.92
Somewhat poor | 61.5515531       10.95       14.88
Somewhat good |246.8282678       43.92       58.80
   Very good | 231.569004       41.20      100.00
--------------+----------------------------------
       Total |        562       100.00
```

Finally, most respondents (about 83%) feel that the level of professionalism their local police department displays is either somewhat good or very good. At the same time, about 17% of respondents feel their neighborhood's police department does not display a high level of professionalism.

When we examine how attitudes vary among respondents, we find that people who are older, better educated, and white were *more likely* to agree that the department displays a high level of professionalism, as were people who live in suburban neighborhoods (see **Model 8** in Appendix B). Compared to non-whites, whites were about 92% *more likely* to rate the professionalism of their police department as good. In addition, older people were about 19% *more likely* – and better educated people about 14% more likely – to report the level of professionalism as good. In contrast, people who live in Cleveland proper were significantly *less likely* to rate the professionalism of their police department as good. There were no significant differences with respect to income, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

Q33 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
(1) "I trust that the police in my neighborhood will protect me when I need them to."
(2) "The police in my neighborhood are effective in controlling crime in my neighborhood."
(3) "I feel safe in my neighborhood during the day."
(4) "I feel safe in my neighborhood at night."
(5) "The police in my neighborhood have too much power."
(6) "The police in my neighborhood act differently toward different groups of people."
(7) "The police officers in my neighborhood treat all people with respect."
[Response categories: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree]

(1) "I trust that the police in my neighborhood will protect me when I need them to."

```
    Agree: Police |
  will protect me |      Freq.      Percent        Cum.
------------------+----------------------------------
Strongly Disagree | 25.1054661        4.47        4.47
        Disagree | 58.2195608       10.36       14.83
           Agree | 270.114144       48.06       62.89
   Strongly agree | 208.560829       37.11      100.00
------------------+----------------------------------
           Total |        562       100.00
```

Interpretation: Most respondents (about 85%) agreed or strongly agreed that they trust the police will protect them when needed, but about 15% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.

However, the regression model shows significant differences in attitudes by age, race, and location. The largest difference is between whites and non-whites (see **Model 9** in Appendix B). Compared to non-whites, whites were about 151% *more likely* to agree that the police will protect them. Older

people were also *more likely* to agree that the police would protect them. <mark>In contrast, people who live in Cleveland proper were also about 59% *less likely* to agree that the police will protect them.</mark> There were no significant differences with respect to education, income, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

---

(2) "The police in my neighborhood are effective in controlling crime in my neighborhood."

Agree: Police control crime	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strongly Disagree	29.8677696	5.31	5.31
Disagree	73.9275409	13.15	18.47
Agree	309.98658	55.16	73.63
Strongly agree	148.21811	26.37	100.00
Total	562	100.00	

Interpretation: Most respondents (about 82%) agreed or strongly agreed that they trust the police are effective in controlling crime in their neighborhood, but about 19% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. Regression analysis reveals significant differences in attitudes by age, income, race, and location (see **Model 10** in Appendix B). <mark>Compared to non-whites, whites were about 92% *more likely* to agree that the police are effective in controlling crime in their neighborhood</mark>. In addition, people who are older and people who earn more money were *more likely* to agree that the police are effective at controlling crime. <mark>In contrast, people who live in Cleveland proper are about 68% *less likely* to agree that the police are effective in controlling crime</mark>. There were no significant differences with respect to education, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

---

(3) "I feel safe in my neighborhood during the day."

Agree: Feel safe daytime	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strongly Disagree	7.96006583	1.42	1.42
Disagree	32.3952097	5.76	7.18
Agree	247.732599	44.08	51.26
Strongly agree	273.912126	48.74	100.00
Total	562	100.00	

Interpretation: Most respondents (about 93%) agreed or strongly agreed that they feel safe in their neighborhood during the day, but about 7% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The regression model, however, shows variation by education, race, and location (see **Model 11** in Appendix B). People who are better educated were about 22% *more likely* to agree that their neighborhood is safe during the day, and <mark>whites were about 75% *more likely* to agree that their neighborhood is safe during the day. In contrast, and people who live in Cleveland proper were *less likely* to agree that their neighborhood is safe during the day.</mark> There were no significant differences with respect to age, income, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

(4) "I feel safe in my neighborhood at night."

```
 Agree: Feel safe |
        nighttime |      Freq.      Percent       Cum.
------------------+-----------------------------------
Strongly Disagree | 39.3308054        7.00        7.00
         Disagree | 79.8244168       14.20       21.20
            Agree |276.9695262       49.28       70.48
   Strongly agree | 165.875252       29.52      100.00
------------------+-----------------------------------
            Total |        562      100.00
```

Interpretation: Most respondents (about 79%) agreed or strongly agreed that they feel safe in their neighborhood at night, but about 20% of respondents disagreed with this statement.

People who were better educated, wealthier, white, and who did not live in Cleveland proper were significantly *more likely* to agree that their neighborhood is safe at night (see **Model 12** in Appendix B). The largest differences in attitudes occurred along racial lines, as well as whether one lived in Cleveland proper. Compared to non-whites, whites were about 166% *more likely* to feel that their neighborhood is safe at night. In contrast, people who live in Cleveland proper were significantly *less likely* to agree that their neighborhood is safe at night. There were no significant differences with respect to age, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

(5) "The police in my neighborhood have too much power."

```
    Agree: Police |
    have too much |
            power |      Freq.      Percent       Cum.
------------------+-----------------------------------
Strongly Disagree | 143.312919       25.50       25.50
         Disagree | 306.834186       54.60       80.10
            Agree | 81.5186045       14.51       94.60
   Strongly agree | 30.3342905        5.40      100.00
------------------+-----------------------------------
            Total |        562      100.00
```

Interpretation: Most respondents (about 80%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the police have too much power, but about 20% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

The regression model shows that younger people, males, non-whites, and people who live in Cleveland proper were significantly *more likely* to agree that the police have too much power (see **Model 13** in Appendix B). People who reside in Cleveland proper were about 68% *more likely* to agree that the police have too much power. Compared to females, males were also about 56% *more likely* to agree that the police have too much power. Non-whites and younger people were also *more likely* to agree that the police have too much power. There were no significant differences with respect to education, income, political ideology, or partisanship.

(6) "The police in my neighborhood act differently toward different groups of people."

```
    Agree: Police |
     treat people |
      differently |      Freq.       Percent        Cum.
------------------+-----------------------------------
Strongly Disagree | 150.087026        26.71        26.71
         Disagree | 249.460102        44.39        71.09
            Agree | 121.270583        21.58        92.67
   Strongly agree | 41.1822894         7.33       100.00
------------------+-----------------------------------
            Total |        562       100.00
```

Interpretation: Most respondents (about 71%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that police act differently toward different groups of people, but about 29% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed.

The regression model shows how attitudes vary based on different types of people (see **Model 14** in Appendix B). Younger people, males, non-whites, Democrats, and people who live in Cleveland proper are significantly *more likely* to agree that the police act differently toward different groups of people. People who reside in Cleveland proper were about 100% *more likely* to agree that the police act differently towards different groups of people. Males were also 78% *more likely* than females to believe that the police act differently towards different groups of people. We also see a difference among partisan lines emerge with Democrats being 52% *more likely* than Independents to agree that the police act differently toward different groups of people. Finally, younger people were *more likely* to agree that the police act differently towards different groups of people. There were no significant differences with respect to education, income, or political ideology.

(8) "The police officers in my neighborhood treat all people with respect."

```
    Agree: Police |
      respect all |      Freq.       Percent        Cum.
------------------+-----------------------------------
Strongly Disagree | 28.7642956         5.12         5.12
         Disagree | 65.3771861        11.63        16.75
            Agree | 289.435924        51.50        68.25
   Strongly Agree | 178.422595        31.75       100.00
```

Interpretation: Most respondents (about 83%) agreed or strongly agreed that police treat all people with respect, but about 17% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The regression model shows that people who are older, people who are white, and people who live outside Cleveland proper are significantly *more likely* to agree that the police in their neighborhood treat all people with respect (see **Model 15** in Appendix B). Older people were about 16% *more likely* – and whites were about 88% more likely – to believe that the police treat everyone with respect. In contrast, people who live in Cleveland proper were *less likely* to agree that the police treat everyone with respect. There were no significant differences with respect to education, income, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

Q35 Now we are going to ask about any experiences you may have had seeking help or assistance from the police. This could include reporting a crime, asking for assistance, calling or going into a police station, or approaching a police officer on the street. Which of the following best describes your experience?
  -I approached the police for help or assistance in the last 12 months (1)
  -I have approached the police for help or assistance, but not in the past 12 months (2)
  -I have never approached the police for help or assistance (3)

```
            Approach police for help |    Freq.     Percent      Cum.
-----------------------------------------+-----------------------------------
(1)I approached the police for help or ass | 120.723774      21.48      21.48
(2)I have approached the police for help o | 204.699939      36.42      57.90
(3)I have never approached the police      | 236.576288      42.10     100.00
-----------------------------------------+-----------------------------------
                                   Total |        562     100.00
```

Interpretation: The cross-tabulations show that about 21% of respondents approached the police for help or assistance in the last 12 months, about 36% have approached the police for help or assistance, but not in the past 12 months, and about 42% have never approached the police for help or assistance.

Respondents who had approached police in the past, were also asked to indicate how they were treated:

Q36 "On the last occasion when you approached the police how do you think you were treated? Would you say you were treated ... Very well (1); Reasonably well (2); Neither well nor poorly (3); Somewhat poorly (4); or Very poorly (5)?"

```
    Approach: Treatment |     Freq.     Percent      Cum.
------------------------+-----------------------------------
          Very well | 174.134348      53.42      53.42
    Reasonably well |  97.4332738      29.89      83.30
Neither well nor poorly |  32.2809191       9.90      93.21
    Somewhat poorly |  15.1581528       4.65      97.85
        Very poorly |   6.9933062       2.15     100.00
------------------------+-----------------------------------
              Total |        326     100.00
```

Interpretation: The cross-tabulations show that about 83% report having been treated very well or reasonably well. Only about 7% of respondents report having been treated poorly. The regression model allows us to see which people thought that they were treated poorly (see **Model 16** in Appendix B). These people tend to be younger, males, and people who live in Cleveland proper. Compared to females, males were about 87% *more likely* to report having been treated poorly. Moreover, people who live in Cleveland proper were about 66% *more likely* to report having been treated poorly. In contrast to previous results, respondents' race did not influence how they reported being treated. There were no significant differences with respect to education, income, political ideology, or partisanship.

Next we asked respondents if they had been approached or stopped by the police.

Q37 "Which of the following best describes any experiences you may have had being approached or stopped by the police? This might involve a police officer stopping you while you were driving or walking, or having an officer come to your home to question you about an incident. The responses include:
-I have been approached or stopped by the police within the last 12 months. (1)
-I have been approached or stopped by the police in the past, but not within the last 12 months. (2)
-I have never been stopped or approached by the police. (3)"

```
                    Stopped by police |     Freq.     Percent       Cum.
---------------------------------------+-----------------------------------
(1)I have been approached or stopped by th | 88.4477276     15.74      15.74
(2)I have been  approached or stopped by t | 255.567156     45.47      61.21
(3)I have never approached or stopped by t | 217.985117     38.79     100.00
---------------------------------------+-----------------------------------
                                Total |       562       100.00
```

Interpretation: These data indicate that about 16% of respondents have been approached or stopped by the police in the last 12 months, about 45% have been approached or stopped by the police, but not in the past 12 months, and about 39% have never been approached or stopped by the police.

Respondents who had been approached or stopped were also asked to indicate how they were treated:

Q38 "On the last occasion you were approached by the police, how do you think you were treated? Would you say you were treated... Very well (1); Reasonably well (2); Neither well nor badly (3); Poorly (4); Very poorly (5)."

```
    Stopped: Treatment |     Freq.     Percent       Cum.
-----------------------+-----------------------------------
           Very well | 135.810018     39.48      39.48
      Reasonably well |112.6859935     32.76      72.24
Neither well nor poorly |  57.912234     16.83      89.07
       Somewhat poorly |  21.7513123      6.32      95.40
          Very poorly |  15.8404425      4.60     100.00
-----------------------+-----------------------------------
              Total |       344       100.00
```

Interpretation: These data show that most respondents (about 72%) report that they were treated either reasonably well or very well. An additional 11% said that they were treated either somewhat poorly or very poorly. Finally, about 17% said that they were treated neither well nor poorly.

The regression model shows differences in perception by age, gender, race, and location (see **Model 17** in Appendix B). Compared to females, males were about 59% *more likely* to report having been treated poorly. In addition, people who live in Cleveland proper were about 56% *more likely* to report having been treated poorly. Compared to whites, non-whites were about 48% *more likely* to report having been treated poorly. Finally, younger people were about 17% *more likely* to report having been treated poorly.

We also asked a question about the portrayal of police in the media:

Q39 ""Forgetting about your own views on the police for a moment, would you say that the news that you have seen, heard, or read within the last month… Made the police look very good (1); Made the police look somewhat good (2); Didn't make the police look good or bad, overall (3); Made the police look somewhat bad (4); or Made the police look very bad (5)?"

```
            News made police look bad |     Freq.      Percent        Cum.
------------------------------------------+----------------------------------
      Made the police look very good | 28.9792162        5.16        5.16
  Made the police look somewhat good | 50.8898164        9.06       14.21
Didn't make the police look good or bad | 120.001567      21.35       35.56
  Made the police look somewhat bad | 222.966903       39.67       75.24
      Made the police look very bad | 139.162497       24.76      100.00
------------------------------------------+----------------------------------
                              Total |       562       100.00
```

Interpretation: These data show that a super majority of respondents (about 64%) believe that the news made the police look somewhat bad or very bad. Only about 14% of respondents reported that the news' portrayal of the police made them look good or very good. Finally, about 21% of respondents reported that the news media made the police look neither good nor bad.

The regression model (see **Model** 18 in Appendix B) shows differences with respect to race and location. Non-whites and people who live in Cleveland proper were less likely to believe that the media make the police look bad versus whites and people who live in the suburbs. Said another way, whites and people who live in suburbs were more likely to believe that the media makes the police look bad. There were no significant differences with respect to age, education, income, gender, political ideology, or partisanship.

Finally, we asked participants questions related to racial disparities in the United States:

Q62 "Please select the statement that comes closer to your own view, even if neither statement is exactly right. The recent killings of unarmed African American men by police in Ferguson, Missouri, and New York City are... Isolated incidents (1) or A sign of broader problems in treatment of African Americans by police (2)."

```
Killings of unarmed blacks |     Freq.      Percent        Cum.
--------------------------+----------------------------------
       Isolated incidents | 281.676093       50.21        50.21
A sign of broader problems | 279.323907       49.79       100.00
--------------------------+----------------------------------
                    Total |       561       100.00
```

Interpretation: The cross-tabs show that Northeast Ohioans are evenly split in their beliefs, with about 50% responding that these were isolated events, and about 50% responding that these events were a sign of broader problems in treatment of African Americans.

For the regression analysis, we recoded this question with "isolated incidents" coded as 1 and "a sign of broader problems" coded as 0. This allowed us to estimate a logistic regression to determine which people were *more likely* to believe that these events were isolated incidents versus a sign of broader problems. The results are displayed in **Model 19** (see Appendix B). Here's how they broke down.

People who believed that these events were a sign of broader problems were *more likely* to be:
- Better educated
- Less wealthy
- Non-white
- Liberal (vs. moderate)
- Moderate (vs. conservative)
- Democrats (vs. Independents)

People who believe that these events were isolated incidents were *more likely* to be:
- Less educated
- Wealthier
- White
- Moderate (vs. liberal)
- Conservative (vs. moderate)
- Independents (vs. Democrats)

There were no significant differences in attitudes with respect to age, gender, or place of residence.

Q64 Please select the statement that comes closer to your own view. Relations between blacks and whites will… Always be a problem for the United States (1); or A solution will eventually be worked out (2)."

```
            Black/White Relations |    Freq.     Percent      Cum.
----------------------------------------+----------------------------------
        Always be a problem for the US |     358       63.70       63.70
A solution will eventually be worked ou |     204       36.30      100.00
----------------------------------------+----------------------------------
                            Total |     562      100.00
```

Interpretation: These data indicate that more people (about 64%) believe that relations between blacks and whites will always be a problem for the United States, whereas about 36% believe that a solution will eventually be worked out.

For the regression analysis, we recoded this question with "always be a problem" coded as 0 and "a solution will be worked out" coded as 1. This allowed us to estimate a logistic regression to determine which people were *more likely* to believe that race relations will always be a problem versus those who believe that a solution will be worked out. The results are displayed in **Model 20** (see Appendix B). Here's how they broke down.

People who believe relations between blacks and whites will always be a problem are *more likely* to be:
- Younger
- Better educated
- Non-whites

People who believe that a solution will eventually be worked out are *more likely* to be:
- Older
- Less educated
- White

There were no significant differences in attitudes with respect to income, gender, ideology, or partisanship.

APPENDIX A: OVERVIEW OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES IN REGRESSION MODELS

Each regression model included the following independent variables: age, education, income, gender, a dummy variable for white (vs. non-white), a dummy variable for liberals (vs. moderates), a dummy variable for conservatives (vs. moderates), a dummy variable for Democrats (vs. Independents), a dummy variable for Republicans (vs. Independents), and a dummy variable for respondents who live in a zip code in the city of Cleveland. Below we outline the distribution of these variables, as well as how they were coded in the analyses:

Age: For age, people were asked to select the category Ordered variable coded as follows:

(1) 18 to 24 (9.4%)
(2) 25 to 34 (17.1%)
(3) 35 to 44 (13.0%)
(4) 45 to 54 (22.5%)
(5) 55 to 64 (17.9%)
(6) 65 or over (20.0%)

Education: For education, respondents were asked to indicate the highest level of education they had completed:

(1) Less than High School (about 2%)
(2) High School / GED equivalent (20.7%)
(3) Some College (25.6%)
(4) 2-year College Degree (10.6%)
(5) 4-year College Degree (24.9%)
(6) Masters, Doctoral, or Professional Degree (16.3%)

Income: For income, people were asked to indicate their annual income: (1) $0 - $25,000; (2) $25,001 - $50,000; (3) $50,001 - $75,000; (4) $75,001 - $100,000; (5) $100,001 - $125,000; (6) $125,001 - $150,000; (7) $150,001 - $175,000; (8) $175,001 - $200,000; and (9) $200,001+. The modal income in our sample was $50,001 to $75,000.

Gender: Dummy variable coded 1 for male (42% male)

Race: Dummy variable coded 1 for white (74% white)

Political ideology: Using a five-item likert-type scale, which ranged from "very liberal" to "very conservative," we created two dummy variables to compare conservatives to moderates and liberals to moderates. The original scale was as follows:

-Very liberal (8%)
-Liberal (19.8%)
-Moderate (45.8%)
-Conservative (19.1%)
-Very conservative (7.4%)

Based on this scale, we created two dummy variables (a) conservative vs. moderates and (b) liberal vs. moderates (26% of respondents identified as either "conservative" or "very conservative" and 28% of respondents identified as either "liberal or "very liberal").

Party identification: Using a seven-item likert-type scale, which ranged from "Strong Democrat" to "Strong Republican," we created two dummy variables to compare Democrats to Independents and Republicans to Independents. The original scale was as follows:

-Strong Democrat (12.5%)
-Democrat (22.1%)
-Weak Democrat (9.6%)
-Independent (32.2%)
-Weak Republican (7.8%)
-Republican (10.9%)
-Strong Republican (5%)

Based on this scale, we created two dummy variables: (a) Democrats vs. Independents and (b) Republicans vs. Independents (24.4% of respondents identified as a Republican, and 42.8% of people identified as Democrats).

Cleveland: In the survey, respondents were asked to report the five-digit zipcode in which they lived. Based on the zipcodes they provided, we created a dummy variable coded as 0 if the respondent did not live in Cleveland, and coded 1 if the respondent lived in Cleveland proper (about 26.9%).

Appendix B: Output Data for Regression Models

```
. // REGRESSION MODEL 1 (ordered logistic regression)
. //Dependent variable: Whether the amount of crime is a major problem in people's neighborhoods
. ologit dq30_1 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -597.63997
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -548.80267
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -548.16453
Iteration 3:   log likelihood =  -548.1625
Iteration 4:   log likelihood =  -548.1625

Ordered logistic regression                    Number of obs    =          562
                                               LR chi2(10)      =        98.95
                                               Prob > chi2      =       0.0000
Log likelihood =  -548.1625                    Pseudo R2        =       0.0828
```

dq30_1	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	-.0062983	.0527283	-0.12	0.905	-.1096439	.0970472
education	-.1530008	.0619753	-2.47	0.014	-.2744702	-.0315314
income	-.0899848	.0512259	-1.76	0.079	-.1903856	.0104161
male	-.0442968	.1708135	-0.26	0.795	-.379085	.2904915
white	-.8755101	.2133083	-4.10	0.000	-1.293587	-.4574336
dummy_liberal	-.2450583	.2065772	-1.19	0.236	-.6499422	.1598255
dummy_conservative	-.0476328	.2260523	-0.21	0.833	-.4906873	.3954216
dummy_democrat	.0179271	.202792	0.09	0.930	-.3795379	.4153921
dummy_republican	-.1055206	.2459886	-0.43	0.668	-.5876494	.3766083
dummy_cleveland	1.071453	.2051696	5.22	0.000	.6693276	1.473578
/cut1	-2.728687	.3829328			-3.479221	-1.978152
/cut2	-.4748853	.3633679			-1.187073	.2373026

```
. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m
```

dq30_1	b	z	P>|z|	%	%StdX	SDofX
age	-0.00630	-0.119	0.905	-0.6	-1.0	1.6170
education	-0.15300	-2.469	0.014	-14.2	-20.1	1.4627
income	-0.08998	-1.757	0.079	-8.6	-14.9	1.7904
male	-0.04430	-0.259	0.795	-4.3	-2.2	0.4938
white	-0.87551	-4.104	0.000	-58.3	-31.9	0.4396
dummy_libe~l	-0.24506	-1.186	0.236	-21.7	-10.4	0.4482
dummy_cons~e	-0.04763	-0.211	0.833	-4.7	-2.1	0.4413
dummy_demo~t	0.01793	0.088	0.930	1.8	0.9	0.4952
dummy_repu~n	-0.10552	-0.429	0.668	-10.0	-4.4	0.4296
dummy_clev~d	1.07145	5.222	0.000	192.0	60.2	0.4396

```
      b = raw coefficient
```

```
     z = z-score for test of b=0
   P>|z| = p-value for z-test
       % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
   %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
   SDofX = standard deviation of X
```

```
.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 2 (ordered logistic regression)
. //Dependent variable: Whether the amount of vandalism is a major problem in people's
neighborhoods
. ologit dq30_2 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]
```

```
(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -580.28304
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -551.35383
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -551.10632
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -551.10601
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -551.10601
```

```
Ordered logistic regression                     Number of obs    =        562
                                                LR chi2(10)      =      58.35
                                                Prob > chi2      =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -551.10601                     Pseudo R2        =     0.0503
```

dq30_2	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	-.0166389	.0520927	-0.32	0.749	-.1187388	.085461
education	-.1722731	.0616093	-2.80	0.005	-.2930251	-.0515212
income	-.0484644	.0519206	-0.93	0.351	-.150227	.0532981
male	-.1814343	.1700583	-1.07	0.286	-.5147424	.1518738
white	-.5491497	.2060276	-2.67	0.008	-.9529565	-.1453429
dummy_liberal	-.0599296	.2046208	-0.29	0.770	-.4609789	.3411197
dummy_conservative	.2797891	.2270209	1.23	0.218	-.1651637	.7247419
dummy_democrat	-.0397721	.198243	-0.20	0.841	-.4283211	.348777
dummy_republican	-.4752537	.2506695	-1.90	0.058	-.9665568	.0160495
dummy_cleveland	.5987883	.1958743	3.06	0.002	.2148818	.9826948
/cut1	-1.751307	.3645198			-2.465752	-1.036861
/cut2	.4094709	.357276			-.2907771	1.109719

```
. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m
```

dq30_2	b	z	P>|z|	%	%StdX	SDofX
age	-0.01664	-0.319	0.749	-1.7	-2.7	1.6170
education	-0.17227	-2.796	0.005	-15.8	-22.3	1.4627
income	-0.04846	-0.933	0.351	-4.7	-8.3	1.7904
male	-0.18143	-1.067	0.286	-16.6	-8.6	0.4938
white	-0.54915	-2.665	0.008	-42.3	-21.4	0.4396
dummy_libe~l	-0.05993	-0.293	0.770	-5.8	-2.7	0.4482
dummy_cons~e	0.27979	1.232	0.218	32.3	13.1	0.4413

```
dummy_demo~t |   -0.03977   -0.201    0.841    -3.9    -2.0    0.4952
dummy_repu~n |   -0.47525   -1.896    0.058   -37.8   -18.5    0.4296
dummy_clev~d |    0.59879    3.057    0.002    82.0    30.1    0.4396
            ----------------------------------------------------------------------
        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X


.
.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 3 (ordered logistic regression)
. //Dependent variable: Whether the amount of trash is a major problem in people's neighborhoods
. ologit dq30_3 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -566.09094
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -520.55312
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -519.80929
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -519.80719
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -519.80719

Ordered logistic regression                     Number of obs    =        562
                                                LR chi2(10)      =      92.57
                                                Prob > chi2      =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -519.80719                     Pseudo R2        =     0.0818


            ----------------------------------------------------------------------
        dq30_3 |     Coef.   Std. Err.     z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
    -------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
           age  | -.2254703    .053501   -4.21   0.000    -.3303302   -.1206103
      education | -.0766261    .0620072  -1.24   0.217    -.1981579    .0449057
         income | -.1856092    .0536249  -3.46   0.001    -.2907121   -.0805063
           male |  .1652145    .1741244   0.95   0.343    -.1760629    .506492
          white | -.5024521    .2096999  -2.40   0.017    -.9134564   -.0914479
  dummy_liberal | -.0342983    .2085948  -0.16   0.869    -.4431365    .3745399
dummy_conservative | -.2996388  .2280849  -1.31   0.189     -.746677    .1473994
 dummy_democrat |  .1656197    .2043311   0.81   0.418    -.2348619    .5661012
dummy_republican |  .2365002   .2512854   0.94   0.347    -.2560101    .7290106
dummy_cleveland |  .8731406    .2014677   4.33   0.000     .4782712    1.26801
    -------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
          /cut1 | -2.378432    .3778572                   -3.119018   -1.637845
          /cut2 |  .1728977    .3637605                   -.5400597    .8858551
            ----------------------------------------------------------------------

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

   Odds of: >m vs <=m


            ---------------------------------------------------------------
        dq30_3 |      b        z      P>|z|      %      %StdX     SDofX
    -------------+-------------------------------------------------------
           age  |  -0.22547   -4.214   0.000    -20.2    -30.6    1.6170
      education |  -0.07663   -1.236   0.217     -7.4    -10.6    1.4627
```

```
      income |   -0.18561    -3.461    0.001    -16.9    -28.3    1.7904
        male |    0.16521     0.949    0.343     18.0      8.5    0.4938
       white |   -0.50245    -2.396    0.017    -39.5    -19.8    0.4396
  dummy_libe~l |   -0.03430    -0.164    0.869     -3.4     -1.5    0.4482
  dummy_cons~e |   -0.29964    -1.314    0.189    -25.9    -12.4    0.4413
  dummy_demo~t |    0.16562     0.811    0.418     18.0      8.5    0.4952
  dummy_repu~n |    0.23650     0.941    0.347     26.7     10.7    0.4296
  dummy_clev~d |    0.87314     4.334    0.000    139.4     46.8    0.4396
------------------------------------------------------------------------
        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X
```

.
.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 4 (ordered logistic regression)
. //Dependent variable: Whether the amount of alcohol/drugs is a major problem in people's
neighborhoods
. ologit dq30_4 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

```
(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -595.54869
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -575.67285
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -575.57233
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -575.57228

Ordered logistic regression                   Number of obs   =        562
                                              LR chi2(10)     =      39.95
                                              Prob > chi2     =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -575.57228                   Pseudo R2       =     0.0335
```

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
       dq30_4 |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
--------------+---------------------------------------------------------------
          age |   .0024508   .0510859     0.05   0.962    -.0976757    .1025772
    education |  -.2394271    .062082    -3.86   0.000    -.3611057   -.1177486
       income |  -.0290753   .0495001    -0.59   0.557    -.1260937    .0679431
         male |   -.177008   .1668388    -1.06   0.289     -.504006     .14999
        white |  -.2749492   .2052593    -1.34   0.180    -.6772501    .1273516
 dummy_liberal |   .0312955   .2023773     0.15   0.877    -.3653568    .4279478
dummy_conservative |    .040413   .2199914     0.18   0.854    -.3907622    .4715882
dummy_democrat |   .0603415   .1967807     0.31   0.759    -.3253416    .4460246
dummy_republican |   .1253733   .2408245     0.52   0.603     -.346634    .5973806
dummy_cleveland |   .4601438    .195856     2.35   0.019     .0762731    .8440146
--------------+---------------------------------------------------------------
        /cut1 |   -2.41296   .3691862                     -3.136552   -1.689369
        /cut2 |  -.3391645   .3529853                     -1.031003    .3526739
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------
      dq30_4 |      b         z       P>|z|      %      %StdX     SDofX
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------
         age |   0.00245    0.048    0.962     0.2      0.4      1.6170
   education |  -0.23943   -3.857    0.000    -21.3    -29.5     1.4627
      income |  -0.02908   -0.587    0.557    -2.9     -5.1      1.7904
        male |  -0.17701   -1.061    0.289    -16.2    -8.4      0.4938
       white |  -0.27495   -1.340    0.180    -24.0    -11.4     0.4396
 dummy_libe~l |  0.03130    0.155    0.877     3.2      1.4      0.4482
 dummy_cons~e |  0.04041    0.184    0.854     4.1      1.8      0.4413
 dummy_demo~t |  0.06034    0.307    0.759     6.2      3.0      0.4952
 dummy_repu~n |  0.12537    0.521    0.603    13.4      5.5      0.4296
 dummy_clev~d |  0.46014    2.349    0.019    58.4     22.4      0.4396
------------------------------------------------------------------------
       b = raw coefficient
       z = z-score for test of b=0
   P>|z| = p-value for z-test
       % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
   %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
   SDofX = standard deviation of X
```

.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 5 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Believe that the amount of tension between races is a major problem
. ologit dq31_1 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -562.66504
Iteration 1:   log likelihood =   -545.542
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -545.46559
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -545.46558

```
Ordered logistic regression                  Number of obs    =         562
                                             LR chi2(10)      =       34.40
                                             Prob > chi2      =      0.0002
Log likelihood = -545.46558                  Pseudo R2        =      0.0306
```

```
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
           dq31_1 |    Coef.    Std. Err.     z     P>|z|    [95% Conf. Interval]
------------------+----------------------------------------------------------
              age |  -.158208   .0525262   -3.01   0.003   -.2611575   -.0552585
        education |  .0021672   .0622331    0.03   0.972   -.1198074    .1241418
           income |  -.041211   .0527946   -0.78   0.435   -.1446866    .0622645
             male |  .1837302   .1713462    1.07   0.284   -.1521022    .5195627
            white |  .0005451   .2049453    0.00   0.998   -.4011404    .4022306
    dummy_liberal |  .0025883   .2067045    0.01   0.990   -.4025451    .4077217
dummy_conservative|  .2902758   .2278612    1.27   0.203   -.1563239    .7368755
   dummy_democrat |  .1060831   .2012945    0.53   0.598    -.288447    .5006131
 dummy_republican |  -.4473354  .2553576   -1.75   0.080   -.9478271    .0531564
  dummy_cleveland |   .631718   .1932701    3.27   0.001    .2529156    1.01052
------------------+----------------------------------------------------------
            /cut1 |  -.3540111  .3587846                   -1.057216    .3491938
            /cut2 |  1.179076   .3634867                     .466655    1.891497
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

Odds of: >m vs <=m

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------
     dq31_1 |      b         z      P>|z|       %      %StdX     SDofX
------------+-------------------------------------------------------
        age |  -0.15821    -3.012    0.003     -14.6    -22.6     1.6170
  education |   0.00217     0.035    0.972       0.2      0.3     1.4627
     income |  -0.04121    -0.781    0.435      -4.0     -7.1     1.7904
       male |   0.18373     1.072    0.284      20.2      9.5     0.4938
      white |   0.00055     0.003    0.998       0.1      0.0     0.4396
dummy_libe~l |   0.00259    0.013    0.990       0.3      0.1     0.4482
dummy_cons~e |   0.29028    1.274    0.203      33.7     13.7     0.4413
dummy_demo~t |   0.10608    0.527    0.598      11.2      5.4     0.4952
dummy_repu~n |  -0.44734   -1.752    0.080     -36.1    -17.5     0.4296
dummy_clev~d |   0.63172    3.269    0.001      88.1     32.0     0.4396
--------------------------------------------------------------------
```

        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X

.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 6 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Believe that "safety of public schools in your neighborhood" is very good
. ologit dq32_1 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -644.15522
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -598.16801
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -597.41521
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -597.4126
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -597.4126

Ordered logistic regression   Number of obs   =   562
                                                LR chi2(10)   =   93.49
                                                Prob > chi2   =   0.0000
Log likelihood = -597.4126   Pseudo R2   =   0.0726

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           dq32_1 |     Coef.    Std. Err.     z     P>|z|    [95% Conf. Interval]
------------------+-------------------------------------------------------------
              age |   .1387922    .0515127    2.69   0.007    .0378291    .2397554
        education |  -.0451728    .0610787   -0.74   0.460   -.1648848    .0745393
           income |   .1444545    .0537211    2.69   0.007    .0391631    .2497459
             male |   .2984499    .1702601    1.75   0.080   -.0352538    .6321536
            white |   .4963016    .2025566    2.45   0.014     .099298    .8933053
    dummy_liberal |  -.3014764    .2034376   -1.48   0.138   -.7002068    .097254
dummy_conservative |  -.1396449    .2303772   -0.61   0.544   -.5911759    .311886
   dummy_democrat |   .1173076    .1983045    0.59   0.554   -.2713622    .5059773
 dummy_republican |   .2787886    .2532752    1.10   0.271   -.2176217    .775199
  dummy_cleveland |  -1.113364    .200724    -5.55   0.000   -1.506776   -.719952
------------------+-------------------------------------------------------------
             /cut1 |  -2.363025    .3936305                  -3.134527   -1.591524
             /cut2 |   -.66371    .3539055                   -1.357352    .029932
             /cut3 |  1.582564    .358898                     .8791366   2.285991
```

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
     dq32_1 |      b         z       P>|z|       %       %StdX      SDofX
------------+------------------------------------------------------------
        age |   0.13879    2.694    0.007      14.9      25.2      1.6170
  education |  -0.04517   -0.740    0.460      -4.4      -6.4      1.4627
     income |   0.14445    2.689    0.007      15.5      29.5      1.7904
       male |   0.29845    1.753    0.080      34.8      15.9      0.4938
      white |   0.49630    2.450    0.014      64.3      24.4      0.4396
dummy_libe~l |  -0.30148   -1.482    0.138     -26.0     -12.6      0.4482
dummy_cons~e |  -0.13964   -0.606    0.544     -13.0      -6.0      0.4413
dummy_demo~t |   0.11731    0.592    0.554      12.4       6.0      0.4952
dummy_repu~n |   0.27879    1.101    0.271      32.2      12.7      0.4296
dummy_clev~d |  -1.11336   -5.547    0.000     -67.2     -38.7      0.4396
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
       b = raw coefficient
       z = z-score for test of b=0
   P>|z| = p-value for z-test
       % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
   %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
   SDofX = standard deviation of X


.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 7 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Believe that the "ability of the police to protect people in your
neighborhood" is very good
. ologit dq32_2 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -633.49042
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -592.78004
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -592.16746
Iteration 3:   log likelihood =  -592.1656
Iteration 4:   log likelihood =  -592.1656

Ordered logistic regression                     Number of obs    =        562
                                                LR chi2(10)      =      82.65
                                                Prob > chi2      =     0.0000
Log likelihood =  -592.1656                     Pseudo R2        =     0.0652

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           dq32_2 |    Coef.    Std. Err.     z     P>|z|    [95% Conf. Interval]
------------------+------------------------------------------------------------
              age |  .1706101     .0521      3.27   0.001    .0684961    .2727242
        education |  .0158709    .0619274    0.26   0.798   -.1055046    .1372463
           income |  .1000284    .0535887    1.87   0.062   -.0050035    .2050604
             male |   .087532    .1702793    0.51   0.607   -.2462093    .4212734
            white |  .4746873    .2054624    2.31   0.021    .0719884    .8773863
    dummy_liberal | -.2812483    .2062365   -1.36   0.173   -.6854644    .1229678
dummy_conservative | -.1075169   .2288368   -0.47   0.638   -.5560288     .340995
   dummy_democrat |   .088896    .1984521    0.45   0.654   -.3000631     .477855
```

```
dummy_republican |    .2398086    .2556897     0.94    0.348     -.261334     .7409511
 dummy_cleveland |   -1.077413    .1977764    -5.45    0.000    -1.465047    -.6897782
-----------------+----------------------------------------------------------------------
           /cut1 |   -2.264571    .4015035                      -3.051504    -1.477639
           /cut2 |    -.635069    .3648279                      -1.350119     .0799806
           /cut3 |    1.633983    .3676958                       .9133127     2.354654
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

```
----------------------------------------------------------------------
      dq32_2 |      b         z       P>|z|      %      %StdX     SDofX
-------------+--------------------------------------------------------
         age |   0.17061     3.275    0.001    18.6      31.8    1.6170
   education |   0.01587     0.256    0.798     1.6       2.3    1.4627
      income |   0.10003     1.867    0.062    10.5      19.6    1.7904
        male |   0.08753     0.514    0.607     9.1       4.4    0.4938
       white |   0.47469     2.310    0.021    60.8      23.2    0.4396
 dummy_libe~l |  -0.28125    -1.364    0.173   -24.5     -11.8    0.4482
 dummy_cons~e |  -0.10752    -0.470    0.638   -10.2      -4.6    0.4413
 dummy_demo~t |   0.08890     0.448    0.654     9.3       4.5    0.4952
 dummy_repu~n |   0.23981     0.938    0.348    27.1      10.9    0.4296
 dummy_clev~d |  -1.07741    -5.448    0.000   -66.0     -37.7    0.4396
----------------------------------------------------------------------
```

        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X

.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 8 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Believe that the "level of professionalism your neighborhood police
department displays" is very good
. ologit dq32_3 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -615.94092
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -574.92427
Iteration 2:   log likelihood =   -574.294
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -574.29189
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -574.29189

```
Ordered logistic regression                   Number of obs   =        562
                                              LR chi2(10)     =      83.30
                                              Prob > chi2     =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -574.29189                   Pseudo R2       =     0.0676
```

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
      dq32_3 |     Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
         age |   .1703344   .0522761     3.26   0.001     .0678752     .2727937
   education |   .1289735   .0627323     2.06   0.040     .0060205     .2519265
```

```
        income |    .0742192    .053426     1.39   0.165    -.0304938    .1789323
          male |   -.2486735   .1722732    -1.44   0.149    -.5863226    .0889757
         white |    .6495437   .2078026     3.13   0.002     .2422581    1.056829
 dummy_liberal |   -.2436655   .2070953    -1.18   0.239    -.6495647    .1622338
dummy_conservative |  .0196975   .2281209     0.09   0.931    -.4274112    .4668061
dummy_democrat |   -.0334145   .2008921    -0.17   0.868    -.4271557    .3603268
dummy_republican |   -.066438   .2539115    -0.26   0.794    -.5640954    .4312193
dummy_cleveland |   -.9623299    .198575    -4.85   0.000     -1.35153     -.57313
---------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
         /cut1 |    -2.07852   .3969702                      -2.856567   -1.300473
         /cut2 |   -.5278255   .3584095                      -1.230295    .1746442
         /cut3 |    1.830188   .3668441                       1.111187     2.54919
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

----------------------------------------------------------------------
      dq32_3 |      b         z       P>|z|      %       %StdX      SDofX
-------------+--------------------------------------------------------
         age |   0.17033    3.258    0.001     18.6      31.7      1.6170
   education |   0.12897    2.056    0.040     13.8      20.8      1.4627
      income |   0.07422    1.389    0.165      7.7      14.2      1.7904
        male |  -0.24867   -1.443    0.149    -22.0     -11.6      0.4938
       white |   0.64954    3.126    0.002     91.5      33.0      0.4396
 dummy_libe~l |  -0.24367   -1.177    0.239    -21.6     -10.3      0.4482
 dummy_cons~e |   0.01970    0.086    0.931      2.0       0.9      0.4413
 dummy_demo~t |  -0.03341   -0.166    0.868     -3.3      -1.6      0.4952
 dummy_repu~n |  -0.06644   -0.262    0.794     -6.4      -2.8      0.4296
 dummy_clev~d |  -0.96233   -4.846    0.000    -61.8     -34.5      0.4396
----------------------------------------------------------------------
       b = raw coefficient
       z = z-score for test of b=0
   P>|z| = p-value for z-test
       % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
   %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
   SDofX = standard deviation of X


.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 9 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Agree with the following statement: "I trust that the police in my
neighborhood will protect me when I need them to."
. ologit dq33_1 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is    5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -614.67971
Iteration 1:   log likelihood =  -571.1843
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -570.24777
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -570.24561
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -570.24561

Ordered logistic regression                    Number of obs    =       562
                                               LR chi2(10)      =     88.87
                                               Prob > chi2      =    0.0000
Log likelihood = -570.24561                    Pseudo R2        =    0.0723
```

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        dq33_1 |     Coef.    Std. Err.      z     P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
           age |  .1785216    .0527436     3.38    0.001     .0751461     .2818972
     education |  .0134886    .0622509     0.22    0.828    -.1085208     .1354981
        income |  .0751548    .0526151     1.43    0.153    -.0279689     .1782785
          male |  .0151147    .1717864     0.09    0.930    -.3215804     .3518099
         white |   .921056    .2119091     4.35    0.000     .5057218     1.33639
 dummy_liberal | -.2487383    .2070269    -1.20    0.230    -.6545037     .157027
dummy_conservative |  .1819906    .2328798  0.78    0.435    -.2744454     .6384267
dummy_democrat |  .1032353    .2028312     0.51    0.611    -.2943065     .5007771
dummy_republican | -.0496471   .2551918   -0.19    0.846    -.5498139     .4505197
dummy_cleveland | -.8900335    .1987804    -4.48    0.000    -1.279636    -.5004312
---------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
         /cut1 | -1.946947    .3942353                      -2.719634    -1.17426
         /cut2 | -.5273766    .3658797                      -1.244488     .1897344
         /cut3 |  2.055069    .3769914                       1.31618      2.793959
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
        dq33_1 |     b         z      P>|z|      %      %StdX     SDofX
--------------+----------------------------------------------------------
           age |  0.17852    3.385    0.001     19.5     33.5     1.6170
     education |  0.01349    0.217    0.828      1.4      2.0     1.4627
        income |  0.07515    1.428    0.153      7.8     14.4     1.7904
          male |  0.01511    0.088    0.930      1.5      0.7     0.4938
         white |  0.92106    4.346    0.000    151.2     49.9     0.4396
 dummy_libe~l | -0.24874   -1.201    0.230    -22.0    -10.5     0.4482
 dummy_cons~e |  0.18199    0.781    0.435     20.0      8.4     0.4413
 dummy_demo~t |  0.10324    0.509    0.611     10.9      5.2     0.4952
 dummy_repu~n | -0.04965   -0.195    0.846     -4.8     -2.1     0.4296
 dummy_clev~d | -0.89003   -4.477    0.000    -58.9    -32.4     0.4396
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X


.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 10 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Agree with the following statement: "The police in my neighborhood are
effective in controlling crime in my neighborhood."
. ologit dq33_2 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is    5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -619.59064
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -575.04196
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -573.66283
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -573.65993
```

```
Iteration 4:    log likelihood = -573.65993

Ordered logistic regression                      Number of obs    =         562
                                                 LR chi2(10)      =       91.86
                                                 Prob > chi2      =      0.0000
Log likelihood = -573.65993                      Pseudo R2        =      0.0741

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        dq33_2 |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
           age |   .0873373    .052832     1.65   0.098    -.0162114    .190886
     education |   .0915218   .0628229     1.46   0.145    -.0316087   .2146524
        income |   .1366234   .0533228     2.56   0.010     .0321125   .2411342
          male |   -.025573   .1725053    -0.15   0.882    -.3636772   .3125312
         white |   .6509901   .2120418     3.07   0.002     .2353958   1.066584
 dummy_liberal |  -.0316461   .2088614    -0.15   0.880    -.4410069   .3777147
dummy_conservative |  .2012378   .2313563    0.87   0.384    -.2522122   .6546879
dummy_democrat |  -.1653166   .2016162    -0.82   0.412     -.560477   .2298439
dummy_republican |  -.0116109   .2575031   -0.05   0.964    -.5163078   .4930859
dummy_cleveland |  -1.149026   .2063959   -5.57   0.000    -1.553555   -.7444979
---------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
         /cut1 |  -1.963884   .3963356                     -2.740688   -1.187081
         /cut2 |  -.4380385   .3710165                     -1.165218    .2891406
         /cut3 |   2.431193   .3854464                      1.675732   3.186654
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

------------------------------------------------------------------------
      dq33_2 |      b         z      P>|z|       %      %StdX     SDofX
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------
         age |   0.08734    1.653    0.098      9.1      15.2     1.6170
   education |   0.09152    1.457    0.145      9.6      14.3     1.4627
      income |   0.13662    2.562    0.010     14.6      27.7     1.7904
        male |  -0.02557   -0.148    0.882     -2.5      -1.3     0.4938
       white |   0.65099    3.070    0.002     91.7      33.1     0.4396
 dummy_libe~l |  -0.03165   -0.152    0.880     -3.1      -1.4     0.4482
 dummy_cons~e |   0.20124    0.870    0.384     22.3       9.3     0.4413
 dummy_demo~t |  -0.16532   -0.820    0.412    -15.2      -7.9     0.4952
 dummy_repu~n |  -0.01161   -0.045    0.964     -1.2      -0.5     0.4296
 dummy_clev~d |  -1.14903   -5.567    0.000    -68.3     -39.7     0.4396
------------------------------------------------------------------------
      b = raw coefficient
      z = z-score for test of b=0
  P>|z| = p-value for z-test
      % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
  %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
  SDofX = standard deviation of X

.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 11 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Agree with the following statement: "I feel safe in my neighborhood
during the day."
. ologit dq33_3 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]
```

```
(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -526.11574
Iteration 1:   log likelihood =   -482.646
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -481.98989
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -481.98834
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -481.98834
```

```
Ordered logistic regression                    Number of obs   =        562
                                               LR chi2(10)     =      88.25
                                               Prob > chi2     =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -481.98834                    Pseudo R2       =     0.0839
```

dq33_3	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	.0813595	.0544329	1.49	0.135	-.0253271	.188046
education	.1980186	.0651004	3.04	0.002	.0704241	.3256131
income	.0872071	.0560762	1.56	0.120	-.0227002	.1971145
male	.2976017	.1806737	1.65	0.100	-.0565122	.6517156
white	.5567754	.2139803	2.60	0.009	.1373818	.976169
dummy_liberal	.1272023	.2142618	0.59	0.553	-.2927431	.5471477
dummy_conservative	-.0066112	.2430239	-0.03	0.978	-.4829293	.4697068
dummy_democrat	-.2746033	.2102936	-1.31	0.192	-.6867711	.1375645
dummy_republican	-.0148367	.2663344	-0.06	0.956	-.5368424	.5071691
dummy_cleveland	-1.018611	.2048615	-4.97	0.000	-1.420133	-.6170901
/cut1	-3.08303	.4985709			-4.060211	-2.105849
/cut2	-1.338893	.3869873			-2.097374	-.5804119
/cut3	1.59559	.3793099			.8521565	2.339024

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

dq33_3	b	z	P>|z|	%	%StdX	SDofX
age	0.08136	1.495	0.135	8.5	14.1	1.6170
education	0.19802	3.042	0.002	21.9	33.6	1.4627
income	0.08721	1.555	0.120	9.1	16.9	1.7904
male	0.29760	1.647	0.100	34.7	15.8	0.4938
white	0.55678	2.602	0.009	74.5	27.7	0.4396
dummy_libe~l	0.12720	0.594	0.553	13.6	5.9	0.4482
dummy_cons~e	-0.00661	-0.027	0.978	-0.7	-0.3	0.4413
dummy_demo~t	-0.27460	-1.306	0.192	-24.0	-12.7	0.4952
dummy_repu~n	-0.01484	-0.056	0.956	-1.5	-0.6	0.4296
dummy_clev~d	-1.01861	-4.972	0.000	-63.9	-36.1	0.4396

```
        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X
```

```
.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 12 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Agree with the following statement: "I feel safe in my neighborhood at
night."
. ologit dq33_4 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is    5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -658.78512
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -590.70101
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -588.12997
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -588.12643
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -588.12643

Ordered logistic regression                      Number of obs   =        562
                                                 LR chi2(10)     =     141.32
                                                 Prob > chi2     =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -588.12643                      Pseudo R2       =     0.1073
```

dq33_4	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	.0638642	.0516144	1.24	0.216	-.0372981	.1650266
education	.1586124	.0619295	2.56	0.010	.0372328	.2799919
income	.1562205	.0536127	2.91	0.004	.0511415	.2612995
male	.1415607	.1717132	0.82	0.410	-.1949909	.4781123
white	.9790544	.2091566	4.68	0.000	.5691151	1.388994
dummy_liberal	.033643	.2043701	0.16	0.869	-.366915	.434201
dummy_conservative	.014714	.2298729	0.06	0.949	-.4358286	.4652566
dummy_democrat	-.1929583	.2004683	-0.96	0.336	-.5858688	.1999523
dummy_republican	.1220304	.2521002	0.48	0.628	-.372077	.6161377
dummy_cleveland	-1.24375	.2023518	-6.15	0.000	-1.640352	-.847148
/cut1	-1.321733	.3735514			-2.05388	-.5895854
/cut2	.1698387	.356852			-.5295782	.8692557
/cut3	2.843675	.3775222			2.103745	3.583605

```
. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m
```

dq33_4	b	z	P>|z|	%	%StdX	SDofX
age	0.06386	1.237	0.216	6.6	10.9	1.6170
education	0.15861	2.561	0.010	17.2	26.1	1.4627
income	0.15622	2.914	0.004	16.9	32.3	1.7904
male	0.14156	0.824	0.410	15.2	7.2	0.4938
white	0.97905	4.681	0.000	166.2	53.8	0.4396
dummy_libe~l	0.03364	0.165	0.869	3.4	1.5	0.4482
dummy_cons~e	0.01471	0.064	0.949	1.5	0.7	0.4413
dummy_demo~t	-0.19296	-0.963	0.336	-17.5	-9.1	0.4952
dummy_repu~n	0.12203	0.484	0.628	13.0	5.4	0.4296
dummy_clev~d	-1.24375	-6.146	0.000	-71.2	-42.1	0.4396

```
      b = raw coefficient
```

```
     z = z-score for test of b=0
  P>|z| = p-value for z-test
     % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
  %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
  SDofX = standard deviation of X
```

```
.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 13 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Agree with the following statement:  "Police in my neighborhood have too
much power."
. ologit dq33_5 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -627.46545
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -605.50392
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -605.21616
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -605.21586
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -605.21586
```

Ordered logistic regression			Number of obs	=	562
			LR chi2(10)	=	44.50
			Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log likelihood = -605.21586			Pseudo R2	=	0.0355

dq33_5	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	-.2042247	.052605	-3.88	0.000	-.3073285	-.1011209
education	.0042272	.0611275	0.07	0.945	-.1155805	.1240348
income	-.0523581	.052343	-1.00	0.317	-.1549484	.0502322
male	.4432131	.1713103	2.59	0.010	.1074511	.7789752
white	-.3683202	.2105024	-1.75	0.080	-.7808973	.0442569
dummy_liberal	-.1178361	.2047775	-0.58	0.565	-.5191927	.2835205
dummy_conservative	-.0568762	.2308404	-0.25	0.805	-.5093151	.3955628
dummy_democrat	-.1918081	.2006399	-0.96	0.339	-.5850551	.2014388
dummy_republican	-.0569343	.2556701	-0.22	0.824	-.5580385	.44417
dummy_cleveland	.5201705	.1998897	2.60	0.009	.1283938	.9119471
/cut1	-2.170067	.3741374			-2.903363	-1.436771
/cut2	.4534872	.3607559			-.2535814	1.160556
/cut3	1.981613	.3888848			1.219413	2.743814

```
. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m
```

dq33_5	b	z	P>|z|	%	%StdX	SDofX
age	-0.20422	-3.882	0.000	-18.5	-28.1	1.6170
education	0.00423	0.069	0.945	0.4	0.6	1.4627
income	-0.05236	-1.000	0.317	-5.1	-8.9	1.7904
male	0.44321	2.587	0.010	55.8	24.5	0.4938
white	-0.36832	-1.750	0.080	-30.8	-14.9	0.4396
dummy_libe~l	-0.11784	-0.575	0.565	-11.1	-5.1	0.4482

```
dummy_cons~e |  -0.05688   -0.246    0.805     -5.5     -2.5     0.4413
dummy_demo~t |  -0.19181   -0.956    0.339    -17.5     -9.1     0.4952
dummy_repu~n |  -0.05693   -0.223    0.824     -5.5     -2.4     0.4296
dummy_clev~d |   0.52017    2.602    0.009     68.2     25.7     0.4396
-----------------------------------------------------------------------
         b = raw coefficient
         z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
         % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
     %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
     SDofX = standard deviation of X
```

.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 14 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Agree with the following statement: "The police in my neighborhood act
differently toward different groups of people.'
. ologit dq33_6 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

```
(sum of wgt is    5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -694.36546
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -652.68115
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -652.06223
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -652.06098
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -652.06098

Ordered logistic regression                    Number of obs    =        562
                                               LR chi2(10)      =      84.61
                                               Prob > chi2      =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -652.06098                    Pseudo R2        =     0.0609

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         dq33_6 |     Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
----------------+-------------------------------------------------------------
            age | -.2342258   .0513573    -4.56   0.000    -.3348842   -.1335674
      education |  .0813234   .0598997     1.36   0.175    -.0360779    .1987247
         income | -.0636759   .0516668    -1.23   0.218    -.1649408    .0375891
           male |  .5783136   .1673288     3.46   0.001     .2503552    .9062719
          white | -.5441048   .2023469    -2.69   0.007    -.9406974   -.1475121
  dummy_liberal |  .0629283   .1974099     0.32   0.750    -.3239879    .4498445
dummy_conservative | -.3190004  .221747   -1.44   0.150    -.7536165    .1156157
 dummy_democrat |  .4197546   .1949151     2.15   0.031      .037728    .8017813
dummy_republican |  .1868115   .2466401    0.76   0.449    -.2965942    .6702173
 dummy_cleveland |  .6922176   .1897499    3.65   0.000     .3203145    1.064121
----------------+-------------------------------------------------------------
          /cut1 | -1.741247   .3608349                     -2.448471   -1.034024
          /cut2 |  .4051891   .3523314                     -.2853678    1.095746
          /cut3 |  2.184062    .37178                       1.455386    2.912737
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

```
----------------------------------------------------------------------
      dq33_6 |      b         z      P>|z|      %      %StdX     SDofX
-------------+--------------------------------------------------------
```

```
           age |   -0.23423    -4.561   0.000    -20.9    -31.5    1.6170
     education |    0.08132     1.358   0.175      8.5     12.6    1.4627
        income |   -0.06368    -1.232   0.218     -6.2    -10.8    1.7904
          male |    0.57831     3.456   0.001     78.3     33.0    0.4938
         white |   -0.54410    -2.689   0.007    -42.0    -21.3    0.4396
  dummy_libe~l |    0.06293     0.319   0.750      6.5      2.9    0.4482
  dummy_cons~e |   -0.31900    -1.439   0.150    -27.3    -13.1    0.4413
  dummy_demo~t |    0.41975     2.154   0.031     52.2     23.1    0.4952
  dummy_repu~n |    0.18681     0.757   0.449     20.5      8.4    0.4296
  dummy_clev~d |    0.69222     3.648   0.000     99.8     35.6    0.4396
----------------------------------------------------------------------
        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
     %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
     SDofX = standard deviation of X
```

```
.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 15 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: Agree with the following statement: "The police officers in my
neighborhood treat all people with respect."
. ologit dq33_8 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is    5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -622.91886
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -585.94661
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -585.21741
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -585.21495
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -585.21495
```

```
Ordered logistic regression                     Number of obs   =        562
                                                LR chi2(10)     =      75.41
                                                Prob > chi2     =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -585.21495                     Pseudo R2       =     0.0605
```

```
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          dq33_8 |     Coef.    Std. Err.      z    P>|z|    [95% Conf. Interval]
-----------------+---------------------------------------------------------------
             age |   .150279   .0527155     2.85   0.004    .0469584    .2535995
       education |   .0947159  .0625563     1.51   0.130   -.0278923    .2173241
          income |   .0629358  .0528052     1.19   0.233   -.0405605    .1664321
            male |  -.1975802  .1716741    -1.15   0.250   -.5340553    .138895
           white |   .6334243  .2128285     2.98   0.003    .2162881    1.050561
   dummy_liberal |  -.1563221  .2071547    -0.75   0.450   -.5623378    .2496936
dummy_conservative|  .1136126  .2268873     0.50   0.617   -.3310783    .5583035
  dummy_democrat |   .0862141  .201452      0.43   0.669   -.3086246    .4810529
 dummy_republican|   .2929635  .2526597     1.16   0.246   -.2022404    .7881674
  dummy_cleveland|  -.8440598  .203351     -4.15   0.000   -1.24262    -.4454991
-----------------+---------------------------------------------------------------
           /cut1 |  -1.775999  .3870104                    -2.534526   -1.017473
           /cut2 |  -.3680719  .3618289                    -1.077243    .3410997
           /cut3 |   2.269915  .3769575                     1.531092    3.008738
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds
```

```
  Odds of: >m vs <=m


  ------------------------------------------------------------------------
       dq33_8 |      b         z       P>|z|      %       %StdX      SDofX
  -------------+----------------------------------------------------------
          age |   0.15028    2.851    0.004     16.2      27.5      1.6170
    education |   0.09472    1.514    0.130      9.9      14.9      1.4627
       income |   0.06294    1.192    0.233      6.5      11.9      1.7904
         male |  -0.19758   -1.151    0.250    -17.9      -9.3      0.4938
        white |   0.63342    2.976    0.003     88.4      32.1      0.4396
  dummy_libe~l |  -0.15632   -0.755    0.450    -14.5      -6.8      0.4482
  dummy_cons~e |   0.11361    0.501    0.617     12.0       5.1      0.4413
  dummy_demo~t |   0.08621    0.428    0.669      9.0       4.4      0.4952
  dummy_repu~n |   0.29296    1.160    0.246     34.0      13.4      0.4296
  dummy_clev~d |  -0.84406   -4.151    0.000    -57.0     -31.0      0.4396
  ------------------------------------------------------------------------
        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X


.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 16 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: "On the last occasion when you approached the police how do you think you
were treated? Would you say you were treated ..."
. // Higher scores = very poorly
. ologit dq36 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   3.0671e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -374.89314
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -353.60506
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -353.36233
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -353.36209
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -353.36209

Ordered logistic regression                     Number of obs    =         326
                                                LR chi2(10)      =       43.06
                                                Prob > chi2      =      0.0000
Log likelihood = -353.36209                     Pseudo R2        =      0.0574


  ------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          dq36 |     Coef.    Std. Err.      z     P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
  -------------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
            age |  -.3194888   .0732477   -4.36    0.000    -.4630517    -.1759259
      education |  -.1214845   .0885736   -1.37    0.170    -.2950855     .0521166
         income |  -.0572588   .0714186   -0.80    0.423    -.1972367      .082719
           male |   .6231242   .2366746    2.63    0.008     .1592506     1.086998
          white |  -.3431633   .2774831   -1.24    0.216    -.8870202     .2006937
   dummy_liberal |    .330752   .2734068    1.21    0.226    -.2051154     .8666194
dummy_conservative |   .2849464   .3123458    0.91    0.362     -.32724     .8971329
  dummy_democrat |   -.083796   .2651991   -0.32    0.752    -.6035768     .4359847
 dummy_republican |  -.3181382   .3525478   -0.90    0.367    -1.009119     .3728427
 dummy_cleveland |   .5067281   .2450807    2.07    0.039     .0263787     .9870775
  -------------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
          /cut1 |  -1.531229   .5088367                     -2.52853    -.5339273
```

```
            /cut2 |    .0941074   .5040953                    -.8939013   1.082116
            /cut3 |    1.142507    .5257733                     .1120101   2.173003
            /cut4 |    2.369837    .6083912                     1.177412   3.562262
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=326): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m


----------------------------------------------------------------------
        dq36 |      b         z      P>|z|       %      %StdX      SDofX
-------------+--------------------------------------------------------
         age |  -0.31949   -4.362   0.000    -27.3    -39.1      1.5530
   education |  -0.12148   -1.372   0.170    -11.4    -15.8      1.4172
      income |  -0.05726   -0.802   0.423     -5.6     -9.7      1.7781
        male |   0.62312    2.633   0.008     86.5     35.6      0.4888
       white |  -0.34316   -1.237   0.216    -29.0    -13.3      0.4171
dummy_libe~l |   0.33075    1.210   0.226     39.2     16.1      0.4505
dummy_cons~e |   0.28495    0.912   0.362     33.0     13.2      0.4352
dummy_demo~t |  -0.08380   -0.316   0.752     -8.0     -4.1      0.4970
dummy_repu~n |  -0.31814   -0.902   0.367    -27.2    -12.7      0.4266
dummy_clev~d |   0.50673    2.068   0.039     66.0     25.9      0.4545
----------------------------------------------------------------------
        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X


.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 17 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: "On the last occasion you were approached by the police, how do you think
you were treated? Would you say you were treated..."
. // Higher scores = very poorly
. ologit dq38 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   3.2423e+02)
Iteration 0:    log likelihood = -463.97716
Iteration 1:    log likelihood = -443.99171
Iteration 2:    log likelihood = -443.82029
Iteration 3:    log likelihood = -443.82015
Iteration 4:    log likelihood = -443.82015

Ordered logistic regression                  Number of obs   =         344
                                             LR chi2(10)     =       40.31
                                             Prob > chi2     =      0.0000
Log likelihood = -443.82015                  Pseudo R2       =      0.0434


----------------------------------------------------------------------------
        dq38 |     Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+--------------------------------------------------------------
         age |   -.18117   .0649476    -2.79   0.005    -.3084649   -.0538751
   education |  -.0788918  .0804641    -0.98   0.327    -.2365986    .0788149
      income |  -.0269548   .063935    -0.42   0.673    -.1522652    .0983556
        male |   .4625811  .2127037     2.17   0.030     .0456895    .8794728
```

```
        white |  -.6555931    .2513098   -2.61   0.009   -1.148151   -.1630348
dummy_liberal |    .155586    .2453444    0.63   0.526   -.3252801    .6364522
dummy_conservative | .0582043  .2899717    0.20   0.841   -.5101298    .6265383
dummy_democrat |   .2562526    .2474262    1.04   0.300   -.2286938    .7411991
dummy_republican | -.1381356   .3221075   -0.43   0.668   -.7694547    .4931835
dummy_cleveland |  .4414564     .235445    1.87   0.061   -.0200074    .9029202
--------------+-----------------------------------------------------------------
        /cut1 |  -1.550092    .456633                    -2.445076   -.6551079
        /cut2 |  -.0363201    .4478591                   -.9141079    .8414677
        /cut3 |   1.179506    .4605938                    .2767587    2.082253
        /cut4 |   2.146438    .4976947                    1.170975    3.121902
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=344): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m

```
---------------------------------------------------------------------
       dq38 |     b         z      P>|z|     %      %StdX     SDofX
------------+--------------------------------------------------------
        age |  -0.18117   -2.789   0.005   -16.6    -25.3    1.6077
  education |  -0.07889   -0.980   0.327    -7.6    -10.8    1.4468
     income |  -0.02695   -0.422   0.673    -2.7     -4.9    1.8791
       male |   0.46258    2.175   0.030    58.8     26.0    0.4997
      white |  -0.65559   -2.609   0.009   -48.1    -25.0    0.4389
dummy_libe~l |  0.15559    0.634   0.526    16.8      7.4    0.4589
dummy_cons~e |  0.05820    0.201   0.841     6.0      2.6    0.4475
dummy_demo~t |  0.25625    1.036   0.300    29.2     13.5    0.4933
dummy_repu~n | -0.13814   -0.429   0.668   -12.9     -5.8    0.4331
dummy_clev~d |  0.44146    1.875   0.061    55.5     21.9    0.4486
---------------------------------------------------------------------
```

      b = raw coefficient
      z = z-score for test of b=0
  P>|z| = p-value for z-test
      % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
  %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
  SDofX = standard deviation of X

.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 18 (ordered logistic regression)
. // Dependent variable: "Forgetting about your own views on the police for a moment, would you
say that the news that you have seen, heard, or read within the last month..
> ."
. // Higher scores = made police look bad
. ologit dq39 age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland[aweight=weight]

(sum of wgt is   5.2968e+02)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -793.81177
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -777.86636
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -777.79366
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -777.79364

```
Ordered logistic regression                    Number of obs    =        562
                                               LR chi2(10)      =      32.04
                                               Prob > chi2      =     0.0004
Log likelihood = -777.79364                    Pseudo R2        =     0.0202
```

```
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
          dq39 |     Coef.    Std. Err.     z     P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
---------------+-------------------------------------------------------------
           age |   .0317224     .049974    0.63    0.526    -.0662248    .1296696
     education |  -.0186647     .057916   -0.32    0.747    -.132178     .0948486
        income |   .0416585    .0482629    0.86    0.388    -.052935     .136252
          male |   .2340816    .1618632    1.45    0.148    -.0831645    .5513277
         white |  -.8609876    .2008025   -4.29    0.000   -1.254553    -.4674219
  dummy_liberal |   .3200817    .1954437    1.64    0.101    -.0629809    .7031442
dummy_conservative |   .503307    .2185464    2.30    0.021     .0749639    .9316501
  dummy_democrat |   .2653141    .1898725    1.40    0.162    -.1068291    .6374574
 dummy_republican |  -.0396194    .2369879   -0.17    0.867    -.5041071    .4248682
  dummy_cleveland |  -.3204047    .1863746   -1.72    0.086    -.6856922    .0448827
---------------+-------------------------------------------------------------
          /cut1 |  -3.116645    .3799612                   -3.861356    -2.371935
          /cut2 |  -1.993545    .3502535                   -2.680029    -1.307061
          /cut3 |  -.7590446    .3416103                   -1.428588    -.0895006
          /cut4 |   1.029025     .343017                    .356724     1.701326
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

. listcoef, help percent

ologit (N=562): Percentage Change in Odds

  Odds of: >m vs <=m


-------------------------------------------------------------------------
          dq39 |      b          z       P>|z|       %       %StdX     SDofX
---------------+---------------------------------------------------------
           age |   0.03172     0.635     0.526      3.2       5.3      1.6170
     education |  -0.01866    -0.322     0.747     -1.8      -2.7      1.4627
        income |   0.04166     0.863     0.388      4.3       7.7      1.7904
          male |   0.23408     1.446     0.148     26.4      12.3      0.4938
         white |  -0.86099    -4.288     0.000    -57.7     -31.5      0.4396
   dummy_libe~l |   0.32008     1.638     0.101     37.7      15.4      0.4482
   dummy_cons~e |   0.50331     2.303     0.021     65.4      24.9      0.4413
   dummy_demo~t |   0.26531     1.397     0.162     30.4      14.0      0.4952
   dummy_repu~n |  -0.03962    -0.167     0.867     -3.9      -1.7      0.4296
   dummy_clev~d |  -0.32040    -1.719     0.086    -27.4     -13.1      0.4396
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
        b = raw coefficient
        z = z-score for test of b=0
    P>|z| = p-value for z-test
        % = percent change in odds for unit increase in X
    %StdX = percent change in odds for SD increase in X
    SDofX = standard deviation of X


.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 19 (logisitic regression)
. // Q62 Please select the statement that comes closer to your own view, even if neither statement
is exactly right. The recent killings of unarmed African American men by
> police in Ferguson, Missouri, and New York City are...
. // (0) A sign of broader problems in treatment of African Americans by police
. // (1) Isolated incidents
. logit isolated age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [iweight=weight]

Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -366.47076
```

```
Iteration 1:    log likelihood = -302.04558
Iteration 2:    log likelihood = -301.70548
Iteration 3:    log likelihood = -301.70493
Iteration 4:    log likelihood = -301.70493
```

```
Logistic regression                          Number of obs    =       561
                                             LR chi2(10)      =    129.53
                                             Prob > chi2      =    0.0000
Log likelihood = -301.70493                  Pseudo R2        =    0.1767
```

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
       isolated |     Coef.    Std. Err.     z     P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
----------------+-------------------------------------------------------------
            age |   .0951921   .0629786    1.51    0.131    -.0282436    .2186277
      education |  -.1882311   .0764556   -2.46    0.014    -.3380813   -.0383809
         income |   .1480513    .064071    2.31    0.021     .0224745    .2736281
           male |  -.0109347   .2079502   -0.05    0.958    -.4185095    .3966401
          white |   1.276991   .2583763    4.94    0.000     .7705827    1.783399
  dummy_liberal |  -.5230661   .2446895   -2.14    0.033    -1.002649   -.0434836
dummy_conservative |  .7486674   .276345    2.71    0.007     .2070413    1.290294
  dummy_democrat |   -.515405   .2352378   -2.19    0.028    -.9764627   -.0543473
dummy_republican |   .4048579   .3047706    1.33    0.184    -.1924814    1.002197
 dummy_cleveland |  -.1531429   .2384541   -0.64    0.521    -.6205043    .3142185
          _cons |  -.9083971   .4288414   -2.12    0.034    -1.748911   -.0678834
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
.
.
. // REGRESSION MODEL 20 (logistic regression)
. // Q64 Please select the statement that comes closer to your own view. Relations between blacks
and whites...
. // Always be a problem for the United States (0)
. //   A solution will eventually be worked out (1)
. logit solution age education income male white dummy_liberal dummy_conservative dummy_democrat
dummy_republican dummy_cleveland [iweight=weight]
```

```
Iteration 0:    log likelihood =  -347.8136
Iteration 1:    log likelihood = -338.00774
Iteration 2:    log likelihood = -337.96222
Iteration 3:    log likelihood = -337.96221
```

```
Logistic regression                          Number of obs    =       562
                                             LR chi2(10)      =     19.70
                                             Prob > chi2      =    0.0322
Log likelihood = -337.96221                  Pseudo R2        =    0.0283
```

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
       solution |     Coef.    Std. Err.     z     P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
----------------+-------------------------------------------------------------
            age |   .1405712    .058917    2.39    0.017      .025096    .2560465
      education |  -.1211336   .0700788   -1.73    0.084    -.2584855    .0162183
         income |   .0650023   .0587053    1.11    0.268     -.050058    .1800625
           male |   .1075214   .1943793    0.55    0.580    -.2734549    .4884978
          white |  -.6402035   .2422544   -2.64    0.008    -1.115013   -.1653937
  dummy_liberal |  -.2713489   .2300682   -1.18    0.238    -.7222742    .1795765
dummy_conservative |  .1868334   .2625338    0.71    0.477    -.3277234    .7013902
  dummy_democrat |    .038201   .2288994    0.17    0.867    -.4104337    .4868356
dummy_republican |  -.2904959   .2843851   -1.02    0.307    -.8478804    .2668887
 dummy_cleveland |  -.0633513   .2243721   -0.28    0.778    -.5031126     .37641
```

```
    _cons |   .8302308     .403439      2.06    0.040      .0395049    1.620957
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```